DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 097 048 JC 740 370

AUTHOR Bobrow, William
TITLE An Examination of the Federal College Work-Study Program at Monterey Peninsula College.
PUB DATE [74]
NOTE 71p.; Master's Thesis, The Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Disadvantaged Youth; Employer Attitudes; *Federal Programs; *Junior Colleges; Masters Theses; Post Secondary Education; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Student Attitudes; Student Needs; Vocational Education; *Work Study Programs
IDENTIFIERS California; *Monterey Peninsula College

ABSTRACT

The work-study program at Monterey Peninsula College was evaluated through questionnaires distributed to students in the program and to their supervisors. In particular, the issues involved in work-study education as related to disadvantaged students were examined. Analysis of the questionnaire data revealed that the work-study students felt that they were gaining skills and were learning. They expressed the need for more training and opportunity to learn, and felt that supervision was important to their working experience. The need for more information and counseling from the Placement Office was also indicated by the students. Supervisors felt that they were providing training and that the students had good attitudes and work habits. The major problems as seen by the supervisors were the students' attendance and punctuality. Some supervisors felt that they should offer better training and counseling and that they needed more information on the students and on the work-study procedures. Most employers felt that the program was providing a learning experience for the students as well as financial aid and that it was aiding the employer by supplying manpower. Some supervisors felt the students were not properly motivated and indicated problems existed with hours and allocations of work-study students. (Copies of the Student Questionnaire and Supervisor's Questionnaire are provided.) (DB)

JC 740370

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 097048

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AN EXAMINATION OF THE FEDERAL COLLEGE WORK-STUDY PROGRAM AT MONTEREY PENINSULA COLLEGE

by

William Bobrow

B.A. Chico State University - 1970

submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements

for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

EDUCATION

Graduate Division

THE MONTEREY INSTITUTE OF FOREIGN STUDIES

Monterey, California

APPROVED: Date:_____

_____

_____

_____

Chairman
Committee in Charge

Deposited in the Institute Library:

_____ _____

date Librarian

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I INTRODUCTION 1

Statement of the Study 1
Purpose of the Study 4
Importance of the Study 5
Explanation of the Federal Work-Study Program 9
Method of Study 15

Chapter II SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE 20

Explanations of the Work-Study Program . . 20
Effects of Work-Study Exposure on Disadvantaged Students 23
Managerial Relations with Disadvantaged Work Groups 26
Examinations of Work-Study Students and Programs 27
Grade Studies 33

Chapter III ANALYSIS OF DATA 37

Work-Study Student Questionnaire 37
Work-Study Supervisor Questionnaire . . . 44
Conclusions 49

Chapter IV SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 52

Chapter V RECOMMENDATIONS 55

Bibliography 56

Attachments

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

STATEMENT OF STUDY

In 1964, Congress enacted the Economic Opportunity Act, Public Law 88-452 to stimulate and promote the part-time employment of students from low-income families who were in need of income to pursue courses of study at institutions of higher education. Monterey Peninsula College is a participant in the Federal Work-Study Program born out of the Economic Opportunity Act. This study will attempt to examine the Federal Work-Study Program at Monterey Peninsula College. We hope to take a look at the program and its premises and to examine the program in light of objectives set by the M.P.C. Placement Office and approved by the Special Services Administration of the school.

In 1971, the job placement aspect of the Work-Study Program was examined and reorganized. Previous to this time student work study job openings were assigned to various departments on campus. This limited the number of job opportunities available to students since the number of job positions assigned to departments was based on the amount of money provided by the federal government to M.P.C. Students had to meet the job requirements set by the various departments or they were unable to obtain employment in spite of the fact that they had qualified

for financial aid. Since supervisors expected the work-study students to have few skills the majority of jobs were menial. Few supervisors thought in terms of training and equipping students with skills. In the reformulation of the Work-Study Program in Fall, 1971, the Placement Office became the functional focus for development for work-study employment opportunities. Work-study monies were now assigned directly to students and employers or potential supervisors were asked to submit job orders to the Placement Office. Work-study students were then exposed to these job orders and after a counseling session with a Placement Officer or his representative they made a job selection.

The author believes that this step along with a great amount of job development has improved the Work-Study Program for both the benefit of students and job supervisors. This study will examine what the supervisor and students are receiving from the program with regards to the objectives of the program and their individual needs. The examination will analyze the success of the placement function at Monterey Peninsula College with respect to the Federal Work-Study Program.

M.P.C. has assumed through this program that working is an educational experience which is capable of providing students with skills and personal growth. The work serves also as a counseling function in that it often provides students with self-respect and experience which adds to their education.

The program participants are most often those students

that have the most difficulty in finding employment. The work-study job may be their first job and the majority are from low-income backgrounds. This study will examine the Monterey Peninsula College Work-Study Program in light of its responses in providing students with employment that helps them acquire skills and also examines student and supervisors satisfaction.

The author believes that the Work-Study Program provides the low-income student with an opportunity to achieve the goals of obtaining skills and personal growth. Furthermore, he feels that this is enhanced when the student is treated as an intelligent human with the potential to make important decisions for himself in the job selection process.

The general premise of the Program is that low income students can attend college, work, and graduate. This means that the students must maintain progress toward the goal of graduating while carrying a strong academic load. Quite often the student is from an educationally deprived background, yet is asked to work fifteen to twenty hours per week while attending school.

Generally, Federal Work-Study Programs are evaluated on the bases of retention rates and grade point averages. While these factors show that the Work-Study Program is functioning adequately across the nation, fewer studies refer to developing work attitudes and on-the-job learning which takes place among work-study students. The M.P.C. Work-Study Program holds that students should be equal partners in the employee-employer

relationship and that students' job situations should take their needs into consideration.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The author has been with the Work-Study Program, as Placement Officer, since the inception of its current approach in methods. He has found that low-income students are generally criticized for their work habits and attitudes as well as lack of work skills. This may be the result of a number of factors including lack of maturity on the part of students, lack of skills or work history, racism on the part of supervisors or students, and possibly the general attitude of blaming a particular group for one's own fault. In this respect we are referring to management problems on the part of supervisors. At the same time Work-Study Programs have been viewed as creating situations where individuals are given money irrespective of their performances on the job. Comments are also common that work-study students are not as responsible as the majority of students.

Usually the criticisms of the Work-Study Program do not deal with the real issues involved since the program is designed to assist low-income students obtain needed money to pursue their education. It also provides these students with an opportunity to develop general work skills and attitudes as well as vocational skills. It places the student in a working environment which he may never have experienced before. On the other side, it supplements supervisors work force through the use of student help. Since the Work-Study Program also expects stu-

dents to have a choice in the selection of their job sights, it hopes to assure that the student interest and participation in his or her job situation will be at a maximum. The author believes that these are important issues in the Work-Study Program and will attempt to prove that they are enhanced by allowing students to become equal partners in the work-study agreement. Thus, he feels that the research will justify this approach to the placement of work-study students.

The research will examine the attitudes of supervisors who have worked with work-study students toward the student and toward the program. It will, also, examine students' and supervisors' satisfaction with the program and will inquire about the training and skill development of the students. Also, the study will seek responses to evaluate the Placement Office. It will look for programmatic problems which may be alleviated through implementation of new program components. The study will analyze participant responses to evaluate the M.P.C. Work Study Program in order to make recommendations for revisions or change. The author believes that the basic approach of the program and its general functioning will be justified in light of the program objectives and the participants responses.

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

Jobs have always been an important part of the college scene in the eyes of both students and the community. "I'm working my way through college," is a statement which typi-

cally draws a great deal of respect. At the same time and especially in this day and age, it is important that students utilize their learning abilities in the acquisition of skills which will help them bridge the gap from campus to community.[1] Jobs provide students with financial aide to ensure progress through school. Over one-half of the people currently attending Monterey Peninsula College are employed either part- or full-time. For many students a job is a source of direct satisfaction and tangible rewards. It furnishes the symbolic independence that self-help encourages. In addition, it provides students with short range goals outside of the immediate academic environment. Thus, it provides an opportunity for success in meeting those short-range goals.

For many work-study students, college means confronting and absorbing a new set of priorities and personal values as well as a new view of the world around. This view should logically include the working world. A part-time on- or off-campus job could be one of the significant elements in giving a socially disadvantaged or unsupported student a clear understanding of college and one of the directions college leads. This is best facilitated if the work situation is relevant in bringing about an effective use of student potential and creates a situation which asks him to improve. Employment in this sense can emphasize independent accomplishment.

---

[1]William E. Toombs, "Campus Jobs and the College Work-Study Program," Financial Aid News, p. 2.

Studies have found that job situations along with an educational program can encourage low income students to stay in school.[2] Also, employment studies indicate that low-income students aspirations and motivation as well as attitudes toward work are enhanced by work exposure.[3]

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 was a vast ambitious program applied as a wide frontal attack to break the barriers binding many of our citizens to poverty or near poverty. Public Law 88-452, Part C, provides for the Federal Work-Study Program. This program has often been evaluated in terms of retention rates and grade point studies. The author hopes to evaluate it on the basis of what it does for the total student and how it functions at Monterey Peninsula College. The M.P.C. program should be encouraging skill growth and the growth of individual responsibility needed to live as citizens in our democracy.

The Federal Work-Study Program at Monterey Peninsula College affects over 200 potential workers in a academic year and approximately 65 supervisors. One measure of importance

---

[2]Philip E. Weil, "The Holding Power of a Work-Study High School for Dropouts," Dissertation Abstracts, 32:1-2 A, p. 682.

[3]Stanley Schneider, Ed.C. "The Effect of Work-Study Programs on Certain Student Behaviors," Dissertation Abstracts, 32:7-8 A, p. 3884; also, Donald Lee Thompson, "An Analysis of the Effects of a Short-Term Work Exposure, Counseling, and Vocational Guidance Programs on the Attitudes, Motivation and Aspirations of Disadvantaged Students," Dissertation Abstracts, 32:3-4 A, p. 1870.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

is that the government saw fit to invest over $100,000 in the Monterey Peninsula College program last year. Two M.P.C. staff people, a Financial Aide Officer and a Placement Officer devoted a good portion of their time to insure that the program worked effectively.

The Monterey Peninsula College program has developed a large number of job options for work-study students. Students can select from these job options or work in the development of a new job for themselves. This is different from the procedure used in the majority of the Work-Study Programs across the country. It takes the Work-Study Program beyond the federal guidelines and provides the addition of student input. This concept hopes to introduce the students to a responsible role in the supervisor-employee relationship. It assumes that students are capable, will learn from employment, and attempts to allow them to choose the employment situation which best suits their needs. At the same time, the program works in providing students with jobs and attempts to satisfy supervisor needs with regard to student help. The author believes that students are receiving a great deal of training, are satisfied with the work environment, are developing skills, undergoing personal growth, and satisfying curiosities and interest. This study will examine the Work-Study Program at M.P.C. in light of the importance of the above factors and its ability to meet them. The outcome of the study will lead to improved programming for the M.P.C. Work-Study Program.

EXPLANATION OF THE FEDERAL WORK-STUDY PROGRAM

The statutory authority for the Federal College Work-Study Program was authorized by Title I, Part C of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Public Law 88-452 as amended. This has since been amended in 1965, 1967 and 1972. The purpose of the College Work-Study Porgram is to expand part-time employment opportunities for students, particularly those from low-income families who are in need of part-time employment in order to pursue studies in institutions of higher education. Federal grants are made to institutions to enable them to create student jobs. The institutions may arrange for the employment of its student at the institutions or for work in the public interest for a public or private non-profit organizations.

The institution of higher education is responsible for the day to day operation of the program including job development, selection of students, placement and supervision of students, payment of students' salaries, maintenance of records and the preparation of required reports. Administrative guidelines for the program are developed by participating institutions to reflect the institution's organization and procedures. Since the student often receives more than one type of financial aid, while attending college, Work-Study must be coordinated with regards to the operations of other student aid programs. The federal share of compensation of students employed in the College Work-Study Program is 80%. The college is responsible for the remaining share which is referred to as the institutional share. A regional Office of Education is responsible for auditing the program. The

College Work-Study Branch, Division of Student Financial Aide in Washington, is responsible for the general administration of the program, including the development of policy and program material and final award of grants to schools.

The college is responsible for the selection of students and their employment under the federal program. The student must meet these requirements: he or she must; (1) be in need of the earning of such employment in order to pursue a course of study at the institution; (2) be capable of maintaining good standings in a course of study while employed under the program; (3) be accepted for enrollment as at least a half-time student at the institution; and (4) be a national of the United States or in the United States for other than a temporary purpose with the intention of becoming a permanent resident of the United States, or a permanent resident of the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands. A student whose parents' income falls in the low-income group must be given preference for employment under the Federal Work-Study Program. To accomplish this, institutions must identify students from low-income families and offer college work-study employment first to these students. After this, employment may be offered to those who are in need. Any student whose parents have a combined yearly income of $3200 or less or whose parents qualify as welfare recipients is considered from a low-income family. For income levels above this figure, the institution allows for additional dependents and considerations are taken into account which include extenuating family circumstances, cost of living variations, and family assets. A student who is independent of family financial support may not be considered as coming from a low-income family

unless the family income level falls in that group. The student may, however, qualify for employment under the program on the basis of his or her own needs.

Once the student's financial needs are assessed he or she is allocated a financial aid package which is usually made up of a number of different financial aid programs. If the student's financial aid allotment includes federal work-study monies, he or she must work to earn these monies. The amount which the student is to earn is stipulated and the student is generally assigned to a job which is held until the College Work-Study allocation has been earned. The wage rate for a particular job should be a function of its duties and responsibilities, and the duties and responsibilities determine the skills and abilities needed to perform the job. Another criteria which is used for establishing the wage rate of a particular work-study student is the prevailing rate at which persons with the particular skills and ability needed are paid in the local area for doing similar work. Students can average no more than 20 hours work per week while school is in session, and can work no more than 40 hours in any one week during vacation periods or any other time when school is in session.

Students may work off-campus if an off-campus agreement is arranged between the college and an off-campus agency. In this case, the agency pays the 20% generally charged to the institution and also may pay administrative costs.

Work provided under the College Work-Study Program must

not include political involvement. That is, the work must not involve any partisan or non-partisan political activity associated with a candidate or contending faction or group running for election for a public or party office. It must also not provide any activity involving transportation of voters to polls or similar assistance connected with any election, and it must not involve any voter registration activity.

The college work-study positions must be free of religious involvement including the instructional operation or maintenance of any or part of any facility that would be used for sectarian instruction or as a place of religious worship.

The College Work Study Program encourages work which provides accomplishments in the public interest. The federal government also encourages that individual programs develop innovative and exciting ways of employing their students.[4]

The objectives of the Monterey Peninsula College Work-Study Program for 1973-74 were to: (1) provide training and educational experience for low-income students by finding them jobs which relate to their majors and/or interest; (2) provide income for low-inome students; (3) counsel students in job and career choices through interviews and referral to Monterey Peninsula College counseling staff; and (4) provide employers or supervisors with student help. Two hundred and three different students were provided with a work-study allocation

---

[4]Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, College Work-Study Manual, 1968, p. v.

over the past academic year. A large number of these students chose not to work or dropped out of school for a variety of reasons. Also, a large number obtained jobs outside of their work-study employment and thus, forfeited their work-study allocation.

Administrative guidelines for the Work-Study Program at M.P.C. are developed by the Financial Aid and Placement Officer under the direction of the Associate Dean of Student Personnel. Operational responsibilities are shared by the Financial Aid Officer, Placement Officer, students' supervisors and the Fiscal Officer. The Financial Aid Officer maintains liaison with the Office of Education, applies for federal work-study funds, developes guidelines and procedures for the selection of the students under federal regulations and documents and determines the actual college work-study allocations. The Placement Officer develops work-study positions on or off-campus, interviews and screens students for placement, negotiates off-campus work-study agreement, provides work-study students with job counseling, maintains liaison with the employers and supervisors of work-study students, places students in jobs and conducts follow-up of placements. Supervisors' responsibilities include final selection of the student for the job, adequate supervision and training for work-study students, providing information as needed for follow-ups, insuring that students' work hours are adequately kept and their time cards turned into the Business Office in time for the students to receive payment

on schedule, and terminating students when necessary. In addition, off-campus employers using work-study students under a work-study agreement with M.P.C. must pay to the college 20% of the student salaries plus 10% for additional payroll cost. The 20% covers the amount of money which the college uses to match federal funds for the work-study student. The Fiscal Officer maintains accounting records including the federal and institutional contributions, administrative expenses, off-campus and federal contributions to work-study agreements, compensation to students, withholding for federal taxes or social security, and assists the Financial Aide Officer in preparation of fiscal reports.

In order for students to be allocated financial aide, they must make application with the Financial Aide Officer. The Financial Aide Officer then reviews his or her financial situation and makes a determination of student need. When an applicant is qualified for the Work-Study Program he or she is then referred to the Placement Office for ~~job counseling~~ and placement.

The Placement Office seeks jobs from potential supervisors through publicity, correspondence and personal contact. Potential supervisors make application for work-study students through an application form which asks for job title, description, needed skills, and hours per week a job requires. When the work-study student comes to the placement office he is counseled and interviewed. The topics covered are: the

Work-Study Program, the responsibilities of a work-study job, and student job interest. These are explored by taking into account factors such as the student's major, job experience, and occupational goals. Pay rates and number of hours a student can work are also discussed, as is the number of weeks the student will be able to work before his work-study allocation is used up. The student then looks through the applications for work study help supplied by supervisors. If the student cannot find a job which suits or maximizes his or her capabilities, the Placement Officer attempts to develop a job for the student. This may be done through personal contact by either the Placement Officer or the student with a potential employer. An agreement is then reached between the potential supervisor, Placement Office and the student as to the student's job responsibilities. Oftentimes training is needed and arranged. Follow-up is maintained through personal contact, student assistants, and follow-up questionnaires which are sent out a few times each semester to supervisors and students.

METHOD OF STUDY

The author has chosen action research for the basic methodology of this study in examining the Work-Study Program at Monterey Peninsula College. Action research emphasizes the involvement of teachers and staff in problems important in their every day working situations. It has as one of its primary goals, the in-service training and development of the program even though it may add to the acquisition of general

knowledge in the science of education. Basically, it is research carried out by a person who feels a need for the results and is in a position to translate the results into action in his working situation.[5]

The steps in action reserach are not different than those in the other types of research methodology. The author has to identify problems, review literature, establish research procedures, and analyze data as he would in any type of research. The questions he formulates for his questionnaire are general questions since he is seeking knowledge for general program improvement.[6] Specifics are avoided in many cases because they lead to specific answers which may tell him about only a specific problem, leaving out of context the whole of a program situation. Generalizations can be extended from this study to a large population or to other Work-Study Programs, but the conclusions reached here are best justified within the Work-Study Program at Monterey Peninsula College.

The author has conducted studies of the M.P.C. Work-Study Program in two previous years. These studies, however, have not been as thorough as the present study. Research procedures were less stringent and the data analyzed was not as extensive. Also, much less time was spent in evaluations of supervisors attitudes.

---

[5]Walter R. Borg, Educational Research, p. 313.

[6]Stephen M. Corey, Action Research to Improve School Practices, pp. 14-15.

In this examination data was collected from questionnaires distributed to students and supervisors. In order to check the validity of the questionnaires they were used on a random sample of the student population to be studied before being used on the entire population. Due to time factors this was not possible to do with the supervisor questionnaires. The questions were constructed by the Placement Officer with the assistance of four work-study students. These students, as part of their work-study assignment, were employed to help conduct the study of their fellow students and the program. Their assistance in helping design the questionnaire came after training sessions in program objectives, program functioning, systems analysis, and the functioning of the Work-Study Program at M.P.C. They were then trained in interviewing and statistical analysis of general responses. At this point questionnaires were distributed. The survey staff consisting of the above students and the author contacted every program participant at the time of the survey. One hundred percent response was obtained from the work-study students and 72% of the supervisors responded. Students who were not working or who had dropped out of school were not contacted. Although important in the functioning of this program, this study is more concerned with those students who participated in employment and their supervisors.

The large percent of student responses were insured by the survey staff setting up a table outside the Business Office

the day the students were to be paid for work performed during the previous month. Checks were held until the questionnaires were completed. The responses to this procedure seemed cheerful and helpful after the purpose of the questionnaire had been explained. The author assumes that responses were honest since the confidentiality of the responses were assured by an elaborate system which is explained in the cover letter of the questionnaire[7] and the student peers used as surveyors probably lessened the feelings of bureaucracy and authority which sometimes results from such programs.

The surveyors delivered the supervisors' questionnaires directly to the supervisors. They explained the study and let the supervisor know that they would be available to pick up the study within a few days. The student questionnaires attempted to discover information about how students felt they were benefiting from their employment, disappointments with their employment, things that they liked about their jobs, ways their jobs could be improved, how they were trained and how it could have been improved, how their supervisors helped them, and the quality of counseling and information which was received from the Placement Office. The work-study supervisor questionnaires asked the supervisors to state the skills students needed for their jobs and the skills which the students lacked. It also asked that the supervisors examine students

---

[7]See attachment 1.

learning due to their jobs, student performance, student training, the employer-employee relationship, how that relationship could be improved, and the student attitude toward the supervisors. We also asked that the supervisors examine the information and assistance received from the Placement Office and to state their attitudes about the Work-Study Program in general.

CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE

The related literature reviewed by the author in this examination of Work-Study Program generally fell into five categories. These were: (1) explanations of Work-Study Programs; (2) effects of work-study exposure on disadvantaged students; (3) managerial relations with disadvantaged work groups; (4) examinations of work-study students and programs; and (5) grade studies of work-study students.

We have attempted to gleen the best information out of that which we were able to find. This is primarily true in the first category dealing with explanation of Work-Study programs. A number of the studies found in this area were repetitive and all spoke in some measure or another about program structure. Very little of the literature we examined in the other areas is not reviewed.

EXPLANATIONS OF THE WORK-STUDY PROGRAM

The author has selected what he believed to be the four best articles in this area. The first, authored by Charles Savitzky in Clearing House, is titled "WTP & EOA: The Educational Challenges of Current Anti-Poverty Programs." Basically, it views work-study as being an attack on the causes and effects of poverty. Written in 1965, Mr. Savitzky believed

that the Federal Work-Study Program was aimed at and would bring the economically disadvantaged person in the mainstream of our education system.[8]

The next article is an address by Peter Mousolite to admissions counselors. He explored the importance of good counseling in the Work-Study Program and the need for leadership in developing off-campus employment. He also stressed using work-study students in social services to serve as examples to other students. Lastly, he felt that education was being challenged by the times and programs like Work-Study, and must adapt to meet the needs of all students.[9]

William E. Toombs of Drexel Institute of Technology presented a paper at the College School Service Financial Aid workshop in June 1966 titled "Campus Jobs and the College Work-Study Program." He stressed the importance of work in the development of character and self-respect. Mr. Toombs felt that this development would be enhanced by follow-up of job placements of work-study students. He viewed the Work-Study Program as one which must exist in a variety of places and settings. That is, the program had to involve counseling, testing, advising, and should generally be supported by all of the areas in the personnel services of the school. He saw

---

[8]Charles Savitzky, "WTP & EOA: The Educational Challenges of Current Anti-Poverty Programs," Clearing House, p. 155.

[9]Peter S. Mousolite, "The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964: The College Work-Study Program," The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Yearbook, pp. 150-53.

the Work-Study Program as having elements which took it beyond financial aid.[10]

The last article in this category which we will examine is by Edward Babbush in the Journal of College Student Personnel. He also believed that the Work-Study Program went beyond financial aid. Mr. Babbush held that it provided students with work experience and a means of avoiding loans and indebtedness. He also believed that Work-Study was one of the best thought out of the anti-poverty programs. It enables a segment of our society to enter school and obtain marketable skills, thus augmenting the effective use of our nation's human resources.[11]

Generalizing from the above studies we can state that: (1) the Federal College Work-Study Program attempts to attack the causes and effects of poverty by using the educational system and providing employment; (2) it is important that Work-Study receive support from the entire range of services within an educational institution; (3) "good" counseling and the development of worthwhile employment is important to Work-Study success; and (4) work experience and skill development are important aspects of the Work-Study Program.

---

[10]William E. Toombs, "Campus Jobs and the College Work-Study Program," Financial Aid News, p. 2.

[11]H. Edward Babbush, "The Work-Study Program in Action," Journal of College Student Personnel, pp. 271-274.

EFFECTS OF WORK-STUDY EXPOSURE ON DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

A number of studies have been written with regards to work exposure on the general population and a smaller number have been written with specific regard to disadvantaged students. The author was unable to find any studies in this area which dealt specifically with the Federal Work-Study Program. He did, however, find three studies from which some generalizations may be drawn.

The first study was by Donald Thompson at West Virginia University.[12] Doctor Thompson analyzed the effects of a ten-week work exposure, counseling, and vocational guidance program on the attitudes, motivation and aspirations of disadvantaged high school students. The findings indicated that the program had a significant effect in raising the subject's level of need for achievement, occupational and educational aspiration, and positive changes in self-concept.

The next study was by Stanley Schneider at the University of New Mexico examining the effects of work-study programs on certain student behaviors.[13] Docotr Schneider wished to prove that work-study programs do not change the characteristics of the potential dropout. The study took place in

---

[12]Donald Lee Thompson, Ed.D., "An Analysis of the Effects of a Short-Term Work Exposure, Counseling, and Vocational Guidance Programs on the Attitudes, Motivation and Aspirations of Disadvantaged High School Students," Dissertation Abstracts.

[13]Stanley Schneider, Ed.D., "The Effect of Work-Study Programs on Certain Student Behaviors," Dissertation Abstracts.

North Babylon, New York, where a general work-study program known as the School to Employment Program and two cooperative programs, the Industrial Cooperative Program and Distributive Education Program, were selected and examined. A control group of students having some of the characteristics of the potential dropout was selected. The findings indicated that the following characteristics of work-study program students changed as compared to the students of the control group: positive attitudes towards school, participation in extra-curricular activities, participation in class projects, and attendance. The students of the work-study programs showed positive changes in a number of characteristics but did not change significantly in level of confidence when compared to students of the control group. A change, which did occur, involved parents' attitude towards school. More interest on the part of the parents toward school and toward the programs after the students had been in the programs for a period of time developed. Thus the study proved Doctor Schneider's hypothesis null.

Doctor Philip Weil at Rutgers University studied the holding power of a work-study high school for dropouts.[14] The main focus of his research was to investigate factors related to the holding power of the Education Center for Youth, an ungraded work-study high school in Newark, New Jersey. The

---

[14]Philip E. Weil, Ed.D., "The Holding Power of a Work-Study High School for Dropouts," Dissertation Abstracts.

retention rate at the center was compared with the holding power of another Newark high school, The Central Evening Adult High School, whose student body consisted mostly of school dropouts. Much of this study does not relate to the current study in which we are now engaged, yet there are some generalizations which may be drawn from Doctor Weil's findings. He found that the following variables were significantly related to students remaining in the program at the Education Center until graduation: (1) grade at time of originally dropping out of high school; the higher the grade the higher the probability of success; (2) length of time that had elapsed since the student originally dropped out of the regular high school; the longer the time, the greater the probability of success; (3) age of the enrollee at the time of entering the program; the older the enrollee, the greater the chances of graduating; (4) job categories; greater success was noted when the student worked for cooperating firms with flexible personnel policies.

There appeared to be no significant relationship between success and the following variables: (1) standardized test scores; (2) marital status of the parents; (3) sex of the students; (4) academic achievement at the center; and (5) size of family of orientation.

The Education Center had a retention rate of 66% which was higher than that of the Newark Central Evening Adult High School at 30.5%. Important is that the results of the pilot experiment in basic skills and the relationship [illegible] job cate-

gories to success in the program seem to point to the importance of flexibility in approach and attitudes when dealing with dropout students.

Reviewing the above we can say that: (1) disadvantaged students gain from work exposure through a raising of aspirations and positive changes in self-concept; (2) potential dropouts' attitudes toward school become more positive when involved in work-study arrangements and their parents may become more interested in their education; (3) flexibility in approach and attitudes is more likely to produce success when working with potential dropouts; and (4) standard predictive variables such as standardized test scores and academic achievement may not be valid when predicting the success of potential dropouts.

MANAGERIAL RELATIONS WITH DISADVANTAGED WORK GROUPS

An interesting study found by the author was made by Doctor Albert Sidney King at Texas Tech University.[15] His study explores the effect of management expectations and actual or perceived performance with regard to disadvantaged workers. Supervisors were lead to believe at the beginning of an employment relationship that certain of their employees could be expected to show considerable working and/or training improvement during the course of employment. The supervisors were

---

[15] Albert Sidney King, D.B.A., "Managerial Relations With Disadvantaged Work Groups: Supervisory Expectations of the Underprivileged Worker," Dissertation Abstracts.

told that predictions as to a given individual's probable work training performance were based on the tests administered to disadvantaged groups prior to their assignment to supervisors for training. In actuality, the individuals designated as having high aptitude potential were chosen at random and bore no relationship to the actual test results, the central hypothesis being that progress and performance tests and other measures of job success during and upon completion of training would indicate that the randomly selected and designated trainees would improve more than the undesignated others comprising a controlled condition. As expected, supervisors in the training situations rated trainees and responded in interviews with more favorable attitudes and evaluations towards workers designated as having high aptitude potential. Results of the study can be analyzed as a case of inter-personal self-fulfilling prophecy and explained in terms of a conceptual theory of expectancy influence and roll behavior.

Thus, we can say that when dealing with disadvantaged work groups supervisors who have a positive concept with regard to their employees' potential will probably increase those employees' probabilities of on-the-job success.

EXAMINATIONS OF WORK-STUDY STUDENTS AND PROGRAMS

In 1966 Eugene Fram finished a doctoral dissertation evaluating the Work-Study Program at the Rochester Institute of Technology. This was not a Federal Work-Study Program and therefore, dealt with a cross section of the student body.

The examination asked if the Rochester Institute of Technology was achieving the objectives established for its work-study program.[16]

The objectives which were achieved will provide us with some generalizations which this author believes extend into and include the M.P.C. Work-Study Program. The study found that the program: (1) enabled the student to relate and supplemented working situations to academic instruction; (2) enabled the student to obtain the earnings to help finance his education; (3) afforded a cooperating company the opportunity to evaluate the student for full-time employment after graduation; (4) enabled the student to review and evaluate his occupational goal. All of these met objectives are important to the Work-Study Program at Monterey Peninsula College.

The remainder of our related literature in this category surveying examinations of work-study students and programs are concerned with the Federal Work-Study Program itself. The first study was conducted by Lloyd Bradfield at the University of North Dakota.[17] He wished to determine whether any differences existed between a group of college freshman male students which could be classified as coming from a low

---

[16]Eugene Harry Fram, Ed.D., "An Evaluation of the Work-Study Program at the Rochester Institute of Technology," Dissertation Abstracts.

[17]Lloyd Eugene Bradfield, D.D., "The Personal Characteristics Related to College Performance and Adjustment of Work-Study and Non-Work-Study Freshman Males," Dissertation Abstracts.

socio-economic level and the control group of ability matched males. Initial differences between the freshman groups in characteristics related to college adjustment. Levels of motivation and vocational aspirations were assessed at the time the groups entered college and again after one semester in order to evaluate the effect of the college experience upon the groups. Number of dropouts and scholastic achievement were also compared at the end of this semester. At the time of college entrance the work-study students differed from the control group in being sufficiently less interested in recreation. They tended to object to structures in their environments, imposed by others as well as themselves, to have less liking for detail and order, and to resist change.

At the end of one semester the work-study students had significantly increased in their desire for status. They also moved in the direction of greater need for freedom and less liking for precision. They showed a significant increase in their need for recreation so that at the end of the period the work-study and control groups no longer differed to a significant degree on this point. Finally the work-study students showed somewhat greater acceptance of change. When grade point averages were compared a non-significant tendency was found for the work-study student to have earned the higher grade point average. Only one student had dropped out of school from the combined groups and he had belonged to the Work-Study Program. However, similarities were noted between

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the personal characteristics of the work-study students and those shown by college dropouts in other studies. This suggested that the work-study groups might contribute more dropouts over a four year period than would the control group. Doctor Bradfield concluded that since the lower socio-economical student demonstrated his capacity for scholastic achievement equivalent to the matched group, no major changes in the college structure need be made to accomodate him. However, subtle changes in college-student relationships need be made to compensate for the work-study students' dislike of structure and conformity. This he believed would maximize the likelihood of the students completing college.

Another study using control groups as a basis of comparison for work-study students was conducted at the University of Alabama by Dorothy Jeanne Glazener Callihan.[18] Doctor Callihan believed that students coming from economically disadvantaged families would show some measurable differences in academic ability or personality patterns from non-work-study students. She did not find this true. Federal college work-study freshmen were compared with work-study freshmen who were employed on campus but were not under the Federal Work-Study Program. The federal work-study students were also compared with college only freshmen. Analysis of the

[18] Dorothy Jeanne Glazener Callihan, Ph.D., "An Analysis of Differences in Experimental Background and Personality Variables Between Work-Study and Non-Work-Study Freshmen at the University of Colorado," Dissertation Abstracts.

data indicated that there was no significant difference among the three groups of students when personality variables and certain selective experiences and background variables were tested, variable by variable. However, the Federal Work-Study students were found to have a lower level of confidence than both of the control groups. Doctor Callihan did note that the possibilities existed that more significant differences could be found between groups if her study were replicated in an institution in another geographic region characterized by students with greater diversity in ethnic, racial and cultural backgrounds.

An analysis of achievement and attitudes of Work-Study participants in the Federal Work-Study Program at the University of Colorado was conducted in 1966 by Frances Falck.[19] The study was designed to determine if there were identifiable factors which differentiated the academically successful student from the academically unsuccessful first year students participating in the Federal Work-Study Program. The study was further designed to investigate the possible effects of a special guidance program during the first semester on academic achievement, self-concept and perceptions of the university environment. The design also provided for the comparison of academic accomplishment between the work-study group and two

---

[19]Frances Elizabeth Falck, Ed.D., "An Analysis of Achievement and Attitudes of Freshman Participants in the Federal Work-Study Program at the University of Colorado," Dissertation Abstracts.

other student populations.

The findings showed that appropriateness of vocational choice, the evaluative factor on the concepts "studying" and "grades" and "value priorities" were found to differentiate significantly the academically successful from the unsuccessful students within the work-study group. No statistically significant results were obtained when comparisons were made between students who participated in the special guidance program and the control students. Also no significant differences were found between the academic accomplishments of the students participating in the Work-Study Program with the comparison group or the freshman class as a whole. The work-study students did as well as the other two groups.

Leo Franklin Johnson at the Boston University School of Education completed a study in 1972 which analyzed the educational outcomes of college work-study experiences in one off-campus institution.[20] Doctor Johnson's institution was the YMCA of Greater Boston, which entered into an off-campus federal work-study agreement. Doctor Johnson examined two variables: (1) the style of management of the student supervisor; and (2) the extent of self-perceived career work congruence.

Results indicated that students who participated in the

---

[20]Leo Franklin Johnson, Ed.D., "An Analysis of Education Outcomes of College Work-Study Experience in One Institution," Dissertation Abstracts.

study tended to see their self, ideal-self, and the YMCA as more powerful than before they began working. They also tended to value their ideal-self, and the YMCA more than before as a result of the work-study experience. The YMCA was also perceived as more active than previously and students who perceived that the job they had was congruent with their career objectives tended to value the YMCA more highly than they had before the experience. The gap between perception of self and ideal-self at the end of the work experience was less for those who experienced high career work congruence and "modern," or open and flexible, management supervision than for those who experienced low career work congruence and "classical," or more structured management supervision. The study has implications for those interested in improving the educational quality of the work learning experience of students. The study indicated that this can be done by: (1) giving attention to the needs of the supervisors of the work learning experience; (2) helping the students to better understand learning opportunities in work settings; (3) assisting the institution in changing its structures to facilitate greater learning; and (4) providing necessary training to enable the learning of students to be maximized.

GRADE STUDIES

A number of people who have studied the effects of work-study jobs on the academic performance of work-study students have shown that employment does not adversely affect work-study

students' academic performance. We have selected three studies as representatives of this.

The first study was completed in 1967 by John Lavery at Michigan State University.[21] The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of working part-time under the Federal College Work-Study Program on the academic achievement of freshman students of State University College Geneseo, New York. This was the first grade study of students on the College Work-Study Program. The results of the study indicated that there were no significant differences between the academic achievement of those students who do or do not work during their freshman academic year.

In May of 1970 the Journal of College Student Personnel published an article by Ray Merritt on the academic performance of work-study students.[22] He compared the grade point averages of students employed on the Federal Work-Study Program with the grade point averages of students who were members of social fraternities and sororities. Mr. Merritt examined ACT scores of the two groups as well as their grades and found that the students belonging to the fraternities and sororities had significantly higher scores, indicating that they would also

---

[21]John William Lavery, Ed.D., "A Study of the Effects of the Federal College Work-Study Program on the Achievement of Freshman College Students of the State University College, Geneseo, New York," Dissertation Abstracts.

[22]Ray Merritt, "Academic Performance of Work-Study Students," The Journal of College Student Personnel, p. 173.

have higher grade point averages.

The result of the study supported the idea that students from low socio-economic levels scored lower on college entrance examinations than individuals from the upper socio-economic levels. However, the academic performance of students from the lower socio-economic levels was equal to that of the other students. Mr. Merritt's study differed from that of Dr. Lavery in that freshmen were omitted from the sample in an effort to control for motivation.

A similar study was conducted by James Hamm at the University of Wyoming.[23] Completed in 1971 the study was conducted of all students assigned to the College Work-Study Program at the University of Wyoming during the Spring Semester of 1970 to determine what, if any, adverse effects could be attributed to employment under the program. A preliminary analysis was undertaken to determine if major differences existed between the work-study group and the university undergraduate enrollment. Among the factors examined in this analysis were academic potential as measured by ACT composite scores, age, sex, class and enrollment in the various colleges of the university. No appreciable differences were apparent.

Upon completion of the study the researchers generally concluded that no adverse effects on academic performance

---

[23]James H. Hamm, Ed.D., "Academic Characteristics of College Work-Study Students at the University of Wyoming, Spring Semester 1970," Dissertation Abstracts.

could be traced to the College Work-Study Program regardless of hours worked, class level, departmental enrollment or sex. With one categorical exception College Work-Study Program students achieved higher grade point averages than those reported by students not employed under the Work-Study Program.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Two questionnaires were distributed to collect data for this study. The first went to federal college work-study students and the second to the students' superviosrs.

One hundred twenty four students were surveyed. Of these 76 or 61% were minority students. All of the students needed to qualify in terms of financial need to be placed in the Work-Study Program. They also had to meet the other qualifications listed in the Explanation of the Program. The students' questionnaire was distributed in early May. The 124 students surveyed represented 100% of the students working at that time.

The work-study supervisors' questionnaire was distributed in late May. At this time, the 124 work-study students were being supervised by 47 different people. Thirty-four or 72% of these people responded to the questionnaire. The students employed by the 34 respondees worked under 47 different job categories or titles. We asked each of these respondees to evaluate the Placement Office and Work-Study Program. This required only 34 responses. (See Attachment 2.)

WORK-STUDY STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

The first three questions on the Work-Study Student Questionnaire were:

(1) I work at _____

(2) My job title is _____

(3) My job activities include _____

These questions were asked so that the students would have to define their job title and activities before answering the rest of the questions. They are not important to our study except as a means of making students look at their jobs before proceeding to answer the rest of the questionnaire. The questions are very general and are seeking a wide range or responses. Thus, it is possible for a student to put down a number of responses in answer to any one question. The author feels that this will provide us with a range of student thought which would be unavailable with more specific questions. If the student answers a question with statements concerning a number of different factors each of those factors are considered in the results when analyzing the questions and answers.

The remainder of the questions and responses are listed below:

Question No. 4

I am benefitting from my job in the following ways:

N = 124

Responses	No. Responses	% of N
1. Gaining and/or Improving skills	66	53%
2. Getting along with people	27	22%
3. Financial support	16	13%
4. General learning and/or experience	12	10%
5. Relates to career	10	8%
6. Learning or exercising responsibility	7	6%
7. Free or study time	3	2%
8. No response	5	4%

Question No. 5

Things that I expected from the job but didn't receive were:

1.	Received what I expected or more	22	18%
2.	More training or opportunity to learn	16	13%
3.	More or better supervision	6	5%
4.	More money or hours	5	4%
5.	More responsibility	4	3%
6.	More work	4	3%
7.	Had no expectations	4	3%
8.	More help (people or supplies)	3	2%
9.	School problems as a result of the job	1	1%
10.	No response	60	48%

Question No. 6

Things that I liked about my job were:

N = 124

Responses	No. Responses	% of N
1. The people I worked with	59	47%
2. Doing the work and gaining experience	48	39%
3. Allowed me to help others	10	8%
4. The hours were convenient	9	7%
5. Everything	6	5%
6. Accepting responsibility	4	3%
7. Allowed to work at own rate of speed	3	2%
8. Job provided study time	3	2%
9. Disliked the job	3	2%
10. The money	3	2%
11. Job was interesting	2	2%
12. No response	3	2%

Question No. 7

My job would have been better if:

N = 124

Responses	No. Responses	% of N
1. Job was satisfactory	23	18%
2. More work hours	17	14%
3. Better organization at job site	16	13%
4. Had different job or worked with different people	16	13%
5. Less work	15	12%
6. More money	14	11%
7. More training	13	11%
8. More work	12	10%
9. More working room and equipment	5	4%
10. More responsibility	5	4%
11. Mentioned personal problems	4	3%
12. Different schedule	3	2%
13. No response	24	19%

Question No. 8

The way I was trained for my job was:

1. On-the-job and in-service training	90	73%
2. Past experience	13	11%
3. School classes	10	8%
4. Received no training	6	5%
5. No response	14	11%

Question No. 9

My training could have been improved by:

N = 124

Responses	No. Responses	% of N
1. More training or supervision	21	17%
2. Training was not needed	15	12%
3. Stronger personal commitment by student	9	7%
4. Better organization	8	6%
5. More technical training	6	5%
6. More experience	6	5%
7. Training was good to excellent	4	3%
8. Taking related classes	2	2%
9. No response	53	43%

Question No. 10

My supervisors helped me by:

1. Being friendly and understanding	37	30%
2. Being available when needed	33	27%
3. Demonstrating	33	27%
4. Giving responsibility	10	8%
5. Teaching new skills	3	2%
6. Did not help	3	2%
7. Firing me	1	1
8. No response	1	8%

Question No. 11

The counseling and information I received from the Job Placement Office was good because:

N = 124

Responses	No. Responses	% of N
1. Got me job that helped me learn	21	17%
2. Helpful, responsive to me	21	17%
3. Information was accurate, efficient	20	16%
4. Helped me get job	15	12%
5. None received or not enough received	11	9%
6. Liked job I got	11	9%
7. Able to choose own job	9	7%
8. Provided information on my money and hours	6	5%
9. Not needed	1	1%
10. No response	23	18%

Question No. 12

The counseling and information I received from the Job Placement Office was bad because:

1. The counseling and information was good	16	13%
2. Did not receive any information or counseling or it was inadequate	13	11%
3. Personal problem with Placement Office employee	1	1%
4. Responded slowly	1	1%
5. Could not get job I wanted	1	1%
6. Hard to get appointment	1	1%
7. No response	88	71%

WORK-STUDY SUPERVISORS' QUESTIONNAIRE

The construction of the Work-Study Supervisors' Questionnaire is very similar to that of the student questionnaire. Once again questions are general and seek a wide range of responses to obtain the total range of supervisors' reaction. The first two questions of the questionnaire are aimed at preparing the supervisor for the questionnaire. The responses to the rest of the questions are listed below:

Question No. 3

Skills my student(s) needed:

N = 47

Responses	No. Responses	% of N
1. Good work habits	36	77%
2. Technical work skills	24	51%
3. Working and communicating with people	13	28%
4. Language skills	10	21%
5. Math skills	4	9%
6. No response	1	2%

Question No. 4

Skills my student(s) lacked:

1. Good work habits	17	36%
2. None or not applicable	14	30%
3. Technical skills	10	21%
4. Working and communicating with people	6	13%
5. Language skills	4	9%
6. No response	6	13%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Question No. 5

Due to the job, my student(s) learned:

N = 47

Responses	No. Responses	% of N
1. Technical skills	38	81%
2. Good work habits	21	45%
3. Working and communicating with people	16	34%
4. Response indicated no learning took place	4	9%
5. Language skills	2	4%
6. Learned about particular programs	2	4%
7. No response	1	2%

Question No. 6

My student's (or students') performance was good because:

1. Good work habits	33	70%
2. Good attitude - able to work with others	32	64%
3. Students were bright and learned quickly	15	32%
4. Students were only adequate or not good	6	13%
5. Good skills	2	4%
6. No response	2	4%

Question No. 7

My student's (students') performance was bad because:

1. Performances were not bad	27	57%
2. Poor attendance and punctuality	10	21%
3. Bad work habits	7	15%
4. Scheduling problems	3	6%
5. Supervisor lacked time	1	2%
6. Work-Study Program restrictions	1	2%
7. No response	9	19%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Question No. 8

My student's (students') training consisted of:

N = 47

Responses	No. Responses	% of N
1. On the job training	27	57%
2. Training sessions	11	23%
3. Training not necessary	4	9%
4. No response	5	11%

Question No. 9 (a)

My relationship with my student(s) was:

1. Good to excellent	33	70%
2. Student/Supervisor	7	15%
3. Student/Teacher	5	11%
4. Poor to Fair	3	6%
5. Friend/Friend	2	4%
6. No response	3	6%

Question No. 9 (b)

My relationship could have been improved by:

1. Better training or counseling	8	17%
2. Not applicable	8	17%
3. Improved work or work habits by students	7	15%
4. No response	24	51%

Question No. 9 (c)

My student's (students') attitude toward me was:

N = 47

Responses	No. Responses	% of N
1. Good to excellent	22	47%
2. Helpful and cooperative	8	17%
3. Respectful	5	11%
4. Unknown	2	4%
5. No response	10	21%

Question No. 10

The information and assistance I received from the Placement Office was good because:

N = 43

1. It was efficient	11	32%
2. It was considerate and concerned	8	24%
3. Not applicable	8	24%
4. It was helpful	6	18%
5. It was prompt	3	9%
6. It was persistent	2	6%

Question No. 11

The information and assistance I received from the Placement Office was bad because:

1. Not applicable	6	18%
2. Didn't receive enough information about students	3	9%
3. Sent unsuitable students	3	9%
4. Not bad	2	6%
5. Errors were made	1	3%
6. Was slow in sending time cards	1	3%
7. No response	17	50%

Question No. 12

I think the Work-Study Program was good because:

N = 34

Responses	No. Responses	% of N
1. Creates learning experience for student	13	38%
2. Helps students continue their education	7	21%
3. Provides help for supervisors	7	21%
4. Students and faculty work together	5	15%
5. Gives students responsibility	2	6%
6. No response	6	18%

Question No. 13

I think the Work-Study Program was bad because:

N = 34

Responses	No. Responses	% of N
1. Not applicable	6	18%
2. Students were not interested or motivated	4	12%
3. Student hours and allocations (determined under federal guidelines)	3	9%
4. No response	21	62%

CONCLUSIONS

The results of the Federal Work-Study Students' Questionnaire indicate that students are gaining and/or improving skills, getting along with people, obtaining, financial support and learning. Most of the students are happy with their jobs but would like more training or opportunity to learn. A good portion of the students would like more and better supervision or training and more responsibility. Significant was the fact that some students would like their money or hours expanded. The students enjoy the people they work with and enjoy working and gaining experience. In some cases they are happy for the opportunty to help others. Some would like to work under more organization. The majority are trained through on-the-job and in-service training. A smaller percentage have acquired their skills through past epxerience and school classes. Some students feel that training was not needed for their jobs. Some feel that they need to make a stronger personal commitment to their jobs. They like their supervisors because they are generally friendly and understanding, available when needed, demonstrate how to do things, and is some cases give responsibility.

They think that the Placement Office is good because it helps them get a job. In a large number of cases this job provided learning and career orientation or training. They found that the Placement Office was helpful and responsive. They also found that the information was generally accurate and that the office was efficient. Some students did not receive

enough information and counseling from the Placement Office and a smaller number indicated that they were happy they were able to choose their own jobs.

When asked what was bad about the Placement Office function, the largest group with a complaint stated that they did not receive any or enough information or counseling.

The Work-Study Supervisors' Questionnaires revealed that the primary skills which supervisors look for in students are good work habits. About half of the supervisors looked for technical work skills and a quarter wanted students who could communicate and work with other people. About 30% needed language and math skills. About one-third of the supervisors said that the students lacked good work habits and 20% stated that they lacked technical skills with about 10% saying that their students needed to improve their language skills. Most of the supervisors felt that their students learned technical skill while on the job and that they picked up good work habits. They felt that their students' performance was good basically because of good work habits and good attitudes.

When asked what was bad about their students' performance about 20% said poor attendance and punctuality, 15% indicated bad work habits. Most of the supervisors provided on-the-job training for students and 23% provided training sessions. They felt that their relationships with their

students were good to excellent. Some felt that they needed to supply better training and counseling. The supervisors felt that the information and assistance received from the Placement Office was good because it was efficient, considerate, and helpful. Those that felt the information and assistance in the Placement Office could be improved said that they didn't receive enough information about students or that unsuitable students were sent to them. Both of these categories only registered 9%. About 40% felt that the Work-Study Pro- was good because it helped create learning experiences for students and approximately 20% said it helped students continue their education with the same amount saying it provided help for supervisors. A small number of supervisors felt that the Work-Study Program was bad because students were not interested or motivated or because of problems with student hours and allocations.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This examination of the Work-Study Program at Monterey Peninsula College has attempted to look at the broad issues involved in work-study education as relates to disadvantaged students. It has then attempted to examine the program at Monterey Peninsula College through questionnaires distributed to the students' supervisors and to the students themselves. The questionnaires asked for general responses which might be interpreted into a measurement of the feelings and attitudes of participants, as well as how their views of the results of the M.P.C. Program.

The author has surveyed the range of related literature and has found that this generally falls into five categories. These are: (1) explanations of work-study programs; (2) effects of work-study programs on disadvantaged students; (3) managerial relations with disadvantaged work groups; (4) examination of work-study students and programs; and (5) grade studies of work-study students. Through our related literature we can conclude that counseling and good jobs are important to the success of the work-study program. Also work-study programs need school support to provide the range of student needs. Work experience and skill development are important to disadvantaged students and work-study programs tend to raise

aspirations, self-concept and positive attitudes towards schools by work-study students. Schools need to be flexible in meeting the needs of their work-study students. In examining managerial relations with disadvantaged work groups the author found that if the supervisor has a positive concept of his employees, the success factor is likely to raise.

It is important that the needs of supervisors be taken into account when providing the work learning experience. It is also positive if students are helped to better understand opportunities in their work settings and if the training is maximized. Lastly, our related literature explored the effects of work on the grades of work-study students. No ill effects were found.

Our questionnaires discovered that M.P.C. work-study students felt that they were gaining skills and were learning. However they felt the need for more training and opportunity to learn and felt that supervision was important to their working experience. The students were happy to be able to select jobs and received many jobs which offered them a learning experience. They felt, however, the need for more information and counseling from the Placement Office. Supervisors felt that they were providing training and commented on the good attitudes and work habits of students. The major problem with work-study students were attendance and punctuality. Some supervisors felt that they needed to supply better training and counseling. They felt that the Placement Office was

doing a good job but that they needed more information about students and that unsuitable students were at times sent to them. In some cases they also felt a need for more information about work-study procedures. Most of the employers felt that work-study was providing a learning experience for students as well as providing them with student help and students with the money to support them through college.

Some supervisors felt that students were not interested or motivated and some remarked about problems with hours and allocations of work-study students.

CHAPTER V

RECOMMENDATIONS

Through his examinations the author has concluded that the work-study program at Monterey Peninsula College is functioning on valid premises. However, it needs to further develop the program along the lines of those premises.

First, the Placement Office must provide adequate counseling for work-study students. This counseling should be more continuous and should be done through follow-up as well as spending more time with the students before the placement.

Work-study students need more jobs with training opportunities. These can be developed off-campus or through more supervisor-placement office contact.

The Placement Office should provide supervisors with more information about students and maintain more constant contact. It should develop guidelines to inform supervisors of the use of work-study students and should encourage supervisors to provide training for their student employees.

More follow-up is necessary to help students and supervisors by the Placement Officer or trained work-study students assistants.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

DISSERTATIONS

Bradfield, Lloyd Eugene, Ed.D. "The Personal Characteristics Related to College Performance and Adjustment of Work-Study and Non-Work-Study Freshmen Males." Dissertation Abstracts. The University of North Dakota.

Briggs, Merold S., Ph.D. "A Comparative Study of the Characteristics of Personality Among Selected Groups of Freshmen in the Work-Study Program at Colorado State College." Research Study Number 1. Dissertation Abstracts. Colorado State College. 1966.

Callihan, Dorothy Jeanne Glazener, Ph.D., "An Analyses of Differences in Experimental Background and Personality Variables Between Work-Study and Non-Work-Study Freshmen at the University of Alabama." Dissertation Abstracts. University of Alabama. 1966.

Falck, Eugene Harry, Ed.D. "An Analyses of Achievement and Attitudes of Freshmen Participants in the Federal Work-Study Program at the University of Colorado." Dissertation Abstracts. University of Colorado. 1966.

Fram, Eugene Harry, Ed.D. "An Evaluation of the Work-Study Program at the Rochester Institute of Technology." Dissertation Abstracts. State University of New York at Buffalo. 1964.

Hamm, James H., Ed.D. "Academic Characteristics of College Work-Study Students at the University of Wyoming, Spring Semester 1970." Dissertation Abstracts. Colorado State College. 1966.

Johnson, Leo Franklin, Ed.D. "An Analysis of Education Outcomes of College Work-Study Experience in One Institution." Dissertation Abstracts. University School of Education. 1972.

King, Albert Sidney, D.B.A. "Managerial Relations With Disadvantaged Work Groups: Supervisory Expectations of the Underprivileged Worker." Dissertation Abstracts. Texas Tech University. 1970.

Lavery, John William, Ed.D. "A Study of the Effects of the Federal College Work-Study Program on the Achievement

of Freshman College Students of the State University College, Geneseo, New York." Dissertation Abstracts. Michigan State University. 1967.

Schneider, Stanley, Ed.D. "The Effect of Work-Study Programs on Certain Student Behaviors." Dissertation Abstracts. The University of New Mexico. 1971.

Tompson, Donald Lee, Ed.D. "An Analysis of the Effects of a Short-Term Work Exposure, Counseling, and Vocational Guidance Programs on the Attitudes, Motivation and Aspirations of Disadvantaged High School Students." Dissertation Abstracts. West Virginia University. 1971.

Weil, Philip E., Ed.D. "The Holding Power of a Work-Study High School for Dropouts." Dissertation Abstracts. Rutgers University. The State University of New Jersey. 1970.

PERIODICALS

Babbush, H. Edward. "The Work-Study Program in Action." The Journal of College Student Personnel. Robert Callis (ed) American College Personnel Association. Washington, D.C.

Merritt, Ray. "Academic Performance of Work-Study Students." The Journal of College Student Personnel. May 1970. Vol. 11 #3.

Mousolite, Peter S. "The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964: The College Work-Study Program." The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Yearbook. 1965.

Nash, George. "The History and Growth of Student Financial Aid." The Journal of the National Association of College Admissions Counselors. November 1968.

Savitzky, Charles. "WTP & EOA: The Educational Challenges of Current Anti-Poverty Programs." Clearing House. November 1965. Vol. 40.

Toombs, William E. "Campus Jobs and the College Work-Study Program." Financial Aid News. June 1967. Vol. 7 #3.

MULTI-VOLUME WORKS

College Student Personnel Institute. College Student Personnel Abstracts. Claremont, California. October 1965-Spring 1974.

Office of Education. Research in Education. Washington, D.C. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. November 1966 through 1972.

Silvey H. M. (ed) Masters Thesis in Education. Vol. 14-22. Cedar Falls, Iowa: Research Publications. 1964-1973.

Wilson, H. W., Co. Education Index. New York. July 1964-June 1973.

Xerox. Comprehensive Dissertation. Index 1861-1972. Vol. 24. Ann Arbor. Education Sf-Z.

Xerox. Dissertation Abstracts International Index. Vol. VII Part #2 Education. U.S.A.: Xerox Corporation. 1970.

SINGLE VOLUME WORKS

Best, John W. Research In Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc. 1970.

Borg, Walter R. Educational Research. New York: David McKay Co., Inc. 1963.

Corey, Stephen M. Action Research to Improve School Practices. New York: Teachers College Columbia University. 1963.

Courtney, E. Wayne (ed) Applied Research in Education. Totowa, New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams & Co. 1965.

Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C. College Work-Study Program Manual. 1968.

MONTEREY PENINSULA COLLEGE

980 FREMONT • MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA 93940 • TELEPHONE (408) 375-9821

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GEORGE J. FAUL
President and Superintendent

May 7, 1974

Dear Work-Study Student:

Enclosed you will find a questionnaire that we would like you to complete and return to us. It is important to us that you fill out the questionnaire completely since it allows us to examine the Work-Study Program and insure that it runs better next year.

On May 10, when you pick up your work-study check, you can return this questionnaire to the Work-Study table which will be set up in front of the Administration Building. The table will be manned by Work-Study Interviewers who will also be able to inform you of the number of hours left in your work-study allocation. You can also return this questionnaire to the Placement Office at any time.

You will not be able to pick up your work-study check until this questionnaire has been returned.

Your answers to the questions will be kept completely confidential. We have insured this by attaching a Work-Study Number to each questionnaire. The number corresponds to your name on a list in my office. Once we receive the questionnaire, we will detach the Work-Study Number. In this way, we know that you have returned your questionnaire and people looking over your answers will not be able to link them to you.

Thank you for your cooperation in this endeavor.

Very truly yours,

Bill Bobrow

Bill Bobrow
Placement Officer

BB:aa

Att.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

LEWIS L. FENTON, *President* MRS. RICHARD ELDRED, *Vice President* RALPH ATKINSON RUSSEL HANSEN SHERMAN SMITH

WORK STUDY NO._____

WORK STUDY STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. I work at _____.
2. My job title is _____
3. My job activities include _____

4. I am benefiting from my job in the following ways: _____

5. Things that I expected from the job but didn't receive were: _____

6. Things that I liked about my job were: _____

7. My job would have been better if _____

8. The way I was trained for my job was: _____

9. My training could have been improved by_____

_____

_____

_____

10. My supervisors helped me by_____

_____

_____

_____

11. The Counseling and Information I received from the Job Placmeent Office was good because_____

_____

_____

_____

12. The Counseling and Information I received from the Job Placement Office was bad because_____

_____

_____

_____

13. COMMENTS:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

MONTEREY PENINSULA COLLEGE
980 FREMONT • MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA 93940 • TELEPHONE (408) 375-9821

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GEORGE J. FAUL
President and Superintendent

Dear Work Study Supervisor:

This is a questionnaire that we would like you to complete and return to us. It is important that you fill out the questionnaire completely, since it allows us to examine the Work-Study program and improve it next year.

We are insuring the confidentiality of your answers through the designated number attached to the first sheet. This number is assigned to your office and correspondes to a listing we have made. Once we receive the questionnaire, we will detach the first sheet. In this way, we know that you have returned your questionnaire, and people looking over your answers will not be able to link them to you.

Thank you very much for your cooperation in this endeavour.

Yours very truly,

Bill Bobrow
Placement Officer

BB:aa

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

LEWIS L. FENTON, *President* MRS. RICHARD ELDRED, *Vice President* RALPH ATKINSON RUSSEL HANSEN SHERMAN SMITH

WORK STUDY SUPERVISORS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Work Station No._____

I work at_____

My job title is_____

If more than one student job title is necessary in your office, please respond by filling out a separate page 2 and 3 for each job title. In cases where you have a number of students working under one job title, please examine the students categorically in your responses.

1. My student's (or students') job title:_____

_____

2. My student's (or students') job activities:_____

_____

_____

_____

3. Skills my student(s) needed:_____

_____

_____

4. Skills my student(s) lacked:_____

_____

_____

5. Due to the job, my student(s) learned:_____

_____

_____

_____

6. My student's (or students') performance was good because:_____

_____

_____

_____

7. My student's (or students') performance was bad because:_____

_____

_____

_____

8. My student's (students') training consisted of:_____

_____

_____

_____

9. a) My relationship with my student(s) was:_____

_____

_____

_____

b) My relationship could have been improved by:_____

_____

_____

_____

c) My student's (students') attitude toward me was:_____

_____

_____

_____

10. The information and assistance I received from the Placement Office was good because:

_____

_____

11. The information and assistance I received from the Placement Office was bad because:

_____

_____

12. I think the Work-Study Program was good because: _____

_____

_____

13. I think the Work-Study Program was bad because: _____

_____

_____

14. COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

OCT 25 1974

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION